

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 7-9 are pending in the application, with claims 7-9 each being the independent claims. The amendments to claims 7-9 are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for not including a cross-reference to related applications as the first sentence. Although Applicants note that the Application Data Sheet as filed in the present application is sufficient to properly claim priority, the specification has been amended to update the priority claim.

Objections to the Drawings

Claims 7-9 were objected to for minor informalities. In particular, claims 7 and 8 are objected to for the phrase "a chute for mowed lawn." Although Applicants assert that this language is clear in the context of the specification, the claims have been amended to recite "a chute for grass clippings."

Claim 9 was objected to for the language "disposed in one of front and rear" and "disposed in the other of front and rear." The claim language has been amended to delete this language.

Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to change "a chute for mowed lawn" to "a chute for grass clippings." This does not change the scope of the claims as the context of "mowed lawn" was clear from the specification. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,138,825 Trefz *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 7 recites that a transmission belt is disposed to one lateral side of the chute for grass clippings, and an oil reservoir is disposed on the other lateral side of the chute opposite the transmission belt. The Trefz *et al.* patent does not disclose such features. The Examiner relies on the collection container 96 of the Trefz *et al.* patent as the reservoir recited in claim 7. However, container 96 is not disposed to the opposite lateral side of the duct 92 as belt 100. They are both on the same lateral side (left in FIG. 5) of the duct 92. Further, claim 7 has been amended to clarify that the reservoir is an oil reservoir, which container 96 is not.

Independent claim 8 recites an axle driving apparatus with an oil reservoir, the oil reservoir disposed sideways from the chute for grass clippings. The Trefz *et al.* patent does not disclose such an arrangement.

Independent claim 9 recites an engine output pulley, an input pulley for an axle driving apparatus, and an idler pulley for the axle driving apparatus. Claim 9 further recites a belt looped over the engine output pulley, the axle driving apparatus input pulley, and the idler pulley, with the belt being disposed to one lateral side of the input pulley, and an oil reservoir for the axle driving apparatus being disposed on the opposite side of the input pulley. The Treftz *et al.* patent does not show such an arrangement. The belt shown in FIG. 5 does not loop over an input pulley for an axle driving apparatus, and the relationship between the input pulley shown in FIG. 4, a belt looped over it, and an oil reservoir is not disclosed.

For the reasons set forth above, the Treftz *et al.* patent does not disclose each and every feature recited in claims 7-9 of the present application and therefore does not anticipate them. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Albert L. Ferro
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,679

Date: July 1, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
277498_1.DOC